DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 357 HE 020 926

AUTHOR Johnson, William L.; Snyder, Karolyn J.
TITLE Faculty Development in Colleges of Education: A Systemic Model.
PUB DATE [87]
NOTE 50p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; Accountability; Educational Assessment; Educational Planning; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Instructional Improvement; Leadership; Models; *Needs Assessment; *Questionnaires; School Effectiveness; *Schools of Education; *Skill Development; Staff Development; Teamwork

ABSTRACT

A model for faculty development in colleges of education was developed based on the research on school planning, program and staff development, and school assessment. A needs assessment instrument was developed to identify training needs of principals in instructional leadership roles, and the instrument was revised to assess training needs of college of education faculty. The model for productive college management focuses on altering learning norms and entails a systems approach. Research indicates that planning in successful schools generally is collaborative and includes setting school improvement goals related to instruction; assigning goal-tasks to teams; and holding individual teachers accountable for their role in the school's success. Staff development is linked to school goals, is planned by staff, and includes workshops and subsequent teaching coaching. Development of the school's program results from instructional standards, and school assessment is based on an accountability model and includes measures of student gains and staff performance as they relate to school goals. The design of the needs development instrument to identify training needs is described in detail. Results of applying the instrument with college of education faculty are summarized. Fifty-three references and four tables including the study instrument are appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290357

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN COLLEGES OF EDUCATION: A SYSTEMIC MODEL

BY

WILLIAM L. JOHNSON
AMBASSADOR COLLEGE
BIG SANDY, TEXAS 75755

KAROLYN J. SNYDER
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA
TAMPA, FLORIDA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William L. Johnson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 020 926

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN COLLEGES OF EDUCATION:

A SYSTEMIC MODEL

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN COLLEGES OF EDUCATION:

A SYSTEMIC MODEL

A model for productive college management is presented in this document. The model is collaborative in nature and focuses on altering learning norms. The model grows out of an ecological approach to college development and is well grounded in research and in a systems approach to management. The model functioned as a basis for surveying the training desires of college faculty in the context of new role demands. Our findings have implications for altering training programs and defining job expectations for faculties in colleges of education.

Management Traditions

Traditional or classical management theory emphasized the structural and managerial subsystems and was concerned with developing principles which would allow work to be accomplished with the maximum efficiency.

Within the classical theory framework, the individual worker was thought of as an object, a part of the bureaucratic machine. Most classical thinkers, such as Max Weber (a German sociologist), Henri Fayol (a French industrialist), and Frederick Taylor (an American industrial engineer), lived through the industrial revolution as it passed its most fervent stages around the turn of the century. As they watched the rapidly growing technology of mass production collide with the traditional patterns of management, which were designed for simpler societies, they saw inefficiency and waste.

Frederick Taylor (1865-1915), the father of scientific management, focused on discovering methods and principles for improving the efficiency of the individual worker by rationalizing the entire production process of any enterprise. Henri Fayol (1841-1925), however, addressing the world of management and the chief executive, produced a general theory of functional organization and administration.

As the classical thinkers began to examine the problems of management erupting in the production centers of society, they developed ideas about work and management. Topics of concern included, among others, the span of control, hierarchy, goal definitions, extrinsic rewards, and formal rules. They argued if their universal scientific principles were applied in almost any organizational setting, the result would be the efficient use of time, materials, and manpower.

The second tradition was the human relationists and behavioral scientists (social systems theorists or socio-political group theorists) who emphasized the psychosocial subsystem and focused on motivation and group dynamics. Within the context of preparing the work environment for maximizing labor efficiency, Elton Mayo, a professor of industrial research at the Harvard School of Business, began his famous illumination study at the Hawthorne Works of the Western Electric Company in Chicago in the 1920's.

The most important finding of his experiments was the discovery of the impact which social-psychological variables within worker groups had on the processes of production. The discovery that workers could control the production process to a considerable degree, independent of the demands of management, shattered many of the precepts central to classical management theory. A new era of organizational management began. Its concern

included such topics as human relations, informal groups, peer pressure, intrinsic rewards, and psychological needs.

The Management science tradition, a more recent school, emphasized the technical subsystem and methods for qualifying decision-making and control processes. These three traditions tended to view organizational life as a closed system. Each approach to organization and management has tended to emphasize particular subsystems, with little recognition of the importance of others. The modern systems view (open systems theory) approaches an organization as an open, sociotechnical system and considers all the primary subsystems and their interactions (Kast and Rosenzweig, 1979).

Beyond these traditions, future theories may well be built around temporary systems, contingency theory, matrix organization and organizational development. Within the context of organizational development, the authors conducted a study on faculty development at a large university in the Southwestern United States.

Our logic was to look at the literature of effective schools and move these research findings to college departments. Research is now showing that school improvement planning, people and program development, and school assessment are important elements in effective schools. Might these elements likewise be important in effective college departments? Could these dimensions be especially important in education departments?

RESEARCH ON EFFECTIVE SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANNING

School-wide Planning

In effective schools, teachers and principals translate collective concerns into specific achievement oriented school improvement goals. Collaborative decision making creates a healthy school climate, which tends to foster a sense of community. Purpose and order for schooling activities result from collaborative goal definitions (Lieberman & Miller, 1978; Armor, 1976; Glenn, 1981; Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Edmonds, 1979).

Team and Task Force Organization and Planning

Effective Schools develop creative approaches for grouping teachers into working teams. Teachers and principals have a collegial working relationship which is exemplified in collaborative action planning, shared decision making and cooperative activity. An interchange of ideas among teachers occurs regularly and permeates school life (Vallina, 1978; Lieberman & Miller, 1978; Austin, 1979; Doss & Holley, 1982).

Individual Performance Planning

In successful schools, both school and teacher goals tend to guide teacher performance. Role expectations are clear and teachers are held

accountable for student performance in effective schools (Lieberman & Miller, 1978; California DPE, 1980; Phi Delta Kappa, 1980).

DEVELOPMENT OF STAFF

Clinical Supervision

In effective schools principals conduct frequent formal and informal observations to coach teachers in their development of instructional skills. "Effective teaching" behaviors guide supervision practices as principals and teachers improve teaching, and subsequently, raise the levels of student achievement (Edmonds, 1982; Clausett & Gaynor, 1982; Levine & Stark, 1981).

Staff Development

Staff development programs, that are school-based and linked to improvement goals, are the most effective programs. Staff development is viewed, in successful schools, as an essential variable to improvement efforts, and is planned by teachers and principals together to address skills that are transferable to the classroom (Miller & Wolf, 1978; Levine and Stark, 1981; Lieberman and Miller, 1978; Glenn, 1981; Vanesky & Winfield, 1979).

Performance Management

In successful schools principals control a complex web of staff interactions. The staff is held accountable for its results individually and collectively in a supportive atmosphere (Lieberman & Miller, 1978; Cohen, 1981; Levine and Stark, 1981).

DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAM

Instructional Program

In effective schools, principals communicate a system of instructional standards to teachers, coordinating schoolwide curriculum, instruction and testing. Teachers plan and carry out programs together, providing a climate of high achievement expectations for all students. The instructional program is characterized by adaptability and consistency in general, and by clear and timely instructional cues, reinforcement, correctives and feedback and by active student participation (Coulson, 1977; Marcus, 1976; Levine & Stark, 1981; Klausemeier, 1982; Edmonds, 1979; Vanesky & Winfield, 1979; Lysakowski and Walbert, 1982).

Resource Management

Principals of successful schools plan for, organize and distribute resources to their staff; resource management is tied to school goals. District resources are used to augment the instructional program (Glenn, 1981; Edmonds, 1979; Madden, 1976).

Community Involvement

Successful schools are characterized by significant parent involvement in the instructional program. Many schools become uniquely successful from effective involvement with a particular community business. High levels of parent or community involvement facilitates student achievement; a greater awareness of community issues; and, tends to result in increased satisfaction between parents and the school (Armor, 1976; Reagan, 1977; Hobson, 1976; Vallina, 1978; Austin, 1979).

SCHOOL ASSESSMENT

School Wide

Principals of successful schools develop a schoolwide accountability model. Measures of schoolwide productivity are evidenced in student achievement gains, work group productivity and staff behavior and performance. Students in effective schools are recognized for their accomplishments (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Edmonds, 1982).

Team Level

No team level assessment practices have been identified which correlate with achievement. It may be that very few assessment practices exist at the team level and therefore cannot be studied. Work group evaluation in productive organizations correlates with success when the evaluation is goal based and results oriented.

Individual Teacher

Successful schools have staff performance reviews by principals. High teacher morale is the chief teacher characteristic in assessing teaching in effective schools. Traditional teacher evaluation programs tend not to correlate with gains in student achievement (Coulson, 1977; Brookover & Lezotte, 1979).

Student

Successful schools are characterized by continuous evaluations of student progress. The greater the involvement of assessment by the principal, the higher is student achievement. Feedback on progress is useful when standards exist for achievement and where principals have high expectations. Student academic self concept, and self reliance tend to be high in effective schools (Vallina, 1978; Clausett & Gaynor, 1982; Gigleotti & Brookover, 1975; Brookover & Lezotte, 1979).

RESEARCH SUMMARY

A picture of the effective school thus emerges. The analysis of instructional leadership tasks verifies that school planning in successful schools generally is collaborative in nature and includes setting school improvement goals that relate to instruction; assigning goal-tasks to teams who plan and carry out their plans collectively; and, holding individual teachers accountable for their role in the school's success through planned and assessed performance. Development of staff is linked to schools goals,

is planned by the staff and includes workshops and subsequent teacher coaching. The staff is held accountable for its development in a supportive atmosphere. Development of the school's program results from a set of instructional standards that tend to guide improvement activities, and which are flexible and directed to mechanisms that foster student mastery. Resources are available and are used to foster achievement of school goals. The community, including parents, are involved in definable ways in the instructional program. School assessment is based on an accountability model and includes measure of student gains, work group productivity and staff performance as they each relate to school goals.

The effective schooling research clearly supports all dimensions of the model (with the exception of team evaluation), and provides clear parameters for defining the roles in leadership for educational productivity.

MODEL DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

Over the past seven years, we have developed a series of training programs for administrators in each task function of the leadership model. The materials have all been individually field tested in various school districts and professional organization management academies.

During our program development, we designed a needs assessment instrument for school district officials to use in identifying the specific training needs of their principals, as they relate to instructional leadership tasks and skills. We will next describe the nature of designing that instrument.

INSTRUMENT DESIGN

The construction and administration of the instrument involved the following steps: (a) development of a pool of instrument questions, (b) development of questionnaire forms, (c) selection of administrative personnel to respond to the instrument, (d) actual administration of the instrument and (e) development of computer programs for reliability and validity assessments of the instrument.

Pertaining to the selection and development of instrument forms, Tittle and Hill (1967) investigated the predictive efficiency of four frequently used attitude measurement techniques in terms of predicting indices of voter behavior. The Thurston, Guttman, Likert and semantic differential scales were compared. The Likert scale was superior to all other scales in predictive validity. Their evidence suggested that in cases where the Likert and Thurston scales were of equal length, the Likert scale exhibited higher reliability.

Two Column Instrument Scale Descriptors

For the first version of the survey instrument, a two column quasi-Likert response form was chosen because of its applicability in general or first-time assessment trials (Witkin, 1977). Discrepancy as defined by Tyler (1949) is understood to mean a difference between some standard of value and an actual status. Sarthory (1977) defined a need as a quantifiable gap in attitude, achievement, or performance between the ideal and the real.

Kaufman (1972) and Southard (1974) identified the four specific components in a discrepancy needs assessment procedure: (1) determine desired conditions, (2) determine existing conditions, (3) analyze discrepancies between the actual and desired conditions, and (4) assign priorities to the discrepancies. These discrepancies constitute indices of need.

Pertaining to the discrepancy format, respondents rated specific statements on two five-point quasi-Likert scales: (a) perception of the degree to which the situation actually exists and (b) perception of the extent to which the situation is desired to exist. The discrepancy between the two scale values, for a specific question, is referred to as the need index.

The discrepancy format response mode included the following two column response categories: (a) competence (consisting of the following scale): (1) no knowledge of; (2) knowledge of; (3) worked with; (4) extensive work with; (5) expertise in; and (6) training (consisting of the following scale): (1) desire no training, skill unrelated; (2) desire no training, competency high; (3) desire awareness session; (4) desire training; and (5) desire further training. The competency column is the actual status while the training column is the desired status. Jenkins and Taber (1977) found in an agree/disagree context that the number of response categories above five did not, in any situation, yield a significant increase in Likert discriminability

Two-Column Instrument Results

A sample of about 200 administrative-type personnel, such as principals, assistant principals, superintendents, assistant superintendents, supervisors, or curriculum directors, responded to the two column instrument.

Specifically, we found that administrative practitioners were unfamiliar with the scoring technique (a correlated *t* test was used to calculate the need index). The literature of statistical procedures is replete, however, with descriptions of and derivations for this procedure (Hicks, 1973; Hinkle & Wiersma, 1979; Kerlinger, 1973; Kirk 1968).

Also there is some question if practitioners can truly assess their competency in this kind of discrepancy-format questionnaire (Witkin, 1977). For these reasons, the next instrument version was changed to a one "desire-training" format.

One-Column Instrument Scale Descriptors

The discrepancy format was changed to a one-column format with the following descriptors: (1) no training (skill unrelated), (2) no training (competency high), (3) training (awareness level), (4) training (initial practice), (5) training (skill refinement), and (6) assistance with school implementation. In constructing the response columns for the scale, the attempt was made to reflect equidistant order in the six categories. In the continuum from "no training (skill unrelated)" to "assistance with school implementation," the categories were ordered.

Next there is the question of a metric base for the variables. Stevens (1946) wrote that factor analysis requires the variables be measured on at least an interval level. This requirement is implied by the use of correlation or covariance matrices as the basic input to factor analysis. If it were argued that the scaling used was not absolutely of a metric base, would a researcher always avoid factor analysis? Kim and Mueller (1978) have written that such is not necessarily so. Many variables, such as measure of attitudes and opinions, do not have a clearly established metric base. Furthermore, it is generally assumed that many ordinal variables may be given numeric values without distorting the underlying properties. The final answer to the question of applying multivariate analysis to a nonmetric variable base really hinges on two considerations: (1) how well the arbitrarily assigned numbers reflect the underlying true distances, and (2) the amount of distortion introduced in the correlation procedures (which become the basic input to factor analysis) by the distortions of scaling. Fortunately, the correlation coefficients are fairly robust with respect to ordinal distortions in measurement (Kim, 1975; Labovitz, 1967, 1970). Hence, as long as one can assume that the distortions introduced by assigning numeric values to ordinal categories are not very substantial, treating ordinal variables as if they are metric variables can be justified (Kim and Mueller, 1978). The scale descriptions were written to reflect as near a metric base as possible. It was felt the distortions were minimal and the application of factor analysis to the data would be consistent with factor analytic models used in instrument development.

One-Column Quasi-Likert Instrument

The scale was constructed to assess administrative training desires in seven specified areas: (1) the principalship; (2) the school as anecological system; (3) creative problem solving; (4) staff development; (5) collaborative long range planning; (6) planning for school growth; and (7) personal awareness.

These subscales and a brief content description of each follows. First was the principalship consisting of questions embracing the perspectives of leadership, planning, organizing, motivating organizational behavior, and controlling. Next was the topic of the school as an ecological system. Questions addressed the environmental suprasystem as well as the goal, psychosocial, structural, technical, and management subsystems.

The third subscale was creative problem solving focusing on real school organizational problems from the perspective of roles, communication skills, and problem solving steps. Next was planning for school growth, which focused on the principal's varied tasks such as action planning and force field analysis.

The fifth subscale addressed was staff development encompassing clinical supervision, inservice training, and evaluation. The sixth subscale was collaborative long-range planning for school improvement which included goal setting, resource assessment, program planning, implementation and monitoring functions, and evaluation procedures. Finally, there was a personal awareness subscale embracing the perspectives of personality characteristics, self-concept, and administrative-style effectiveness. The questions were then randomly assigned to the test form.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE ONE-COLUMN INSTRUMENT

The number of cases used in the scale validation was 442. This number was arrived at by having at least five times as many subjects as try-out items (Lemke & Wiersma, 1976; Nunnally, 1970).

Participant summary data, listing the participating school districts and the number of participants from each district, follows: (1) Amarillo, Texas (Amarillo Independent School District, 52 cases); (2) Burlington, North Carolina (Burlington City Schools, 23 cases); (3) Dickinson, Texas (Dickinson Independent School District, 16 cases); (4) Fort Worth, Texas (Forth Worth Independent School District, 195 cases); (5) Phoenix, Arizona (Paradise Valley Unified School District, 15 cases); (6) Raytown, Missouri (Consolidated School District Number Two, 31 cases); (7) St. Louis, Missouri (Ritenour School District, 23 cases); (8) Wichita, Kansas (Wichita Independent School District, 84 cases); and (9) separate responses (three cases).

The respondents' professional classifications and group totals are as follows: (1) elementary principals and assistant principals (229 cases); (2) middle and junior high principals and assistant principals (45 cases); (3) secondary principals and assistant principals (57 cases); (4) superintendents and assistant superintendents (18 cases); (5) supervisors and curriculum directors (77 cases); (6) education service center personnel (8 cases); and (7) unsigned catagory composite (8 cases).

FINAL SCALE ANALYSIS OF THE ONE-COLUMN INSTRUMENT

The collected pool of data was submitted to factor and subscale analysis (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975). Instrument validity was established by two methods. First content validity involves essentially the systematic examination of the scale content to determine whether it covers a representative sample of the domain to be measured (Anastasi, 1976; Ebel, 1956; Huddleston, 1956; Lennon, 1956). Representative selection of items and sensible test construction are cited by Nunnally (1967) as the standard means of ensuring content validity.

The content validity of the ACT instrument was established therefore in the following manner: each subscale area was reviewed and questions were written which were believed to be representative of the behaviors, attitudes, or characteristics to be measured.

Next, construct validity was established. The construct validity of a test is the extent to which the test may be said to measure a theoretical construct or trait (Anastasi, 1976). Essential to the notion of construct validity is the internal consistency of the items (Nunnally, 1967). Of particular relevance to construct validity is factor analysis. Lemke and Wiersma (1976) have stated that factor analysis is a refined technique for analyzing the interrelationships of behavior data, simplifying the description of data by reducing the number of necessary variables or dimensions (Anastasi, 1976; Kim & Mueller, 1978). A stepwise factor analysis was applied specifically to examine the way in which the scale items grouped together. The factoring method was PA2; the method of rotation was varimax since the correlations between the various factors were low.

Specifically scale items were retained in the instrument only if they had a factor loading greater than or equal to .40. The rule of thumb often used in this context is to consider factor loading less than .30 as not substantial (Kim & Mueller, 1978).

Evaluation of the reliability of the instrument was accomplished through use of the Kuder-Richardson generalized reliability formula, coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951; Ebel, 1965; Novick & Lewis, 1967). This formula was appropriate since a Likert scaling format was employed in the instrument form.

Application of Cronbach's alpha to all the collected data for the final test version yielded a reliability coefficient of .96, which is considerably higher than the minimum value of .50 often cited as necessary for the evaluation of group achievement and slightly larger than the value of .90 cited as necessary for the assessment of individual achievement (Cronbach, 1970). Anastasi (1976) has posited that it is desirable for reliability coefficients to fall in the range of .80s or .90s. The reliability of the instrument was shown to be high.

Fifty items remained in the instrument following the elimination of 26 items suggested as inappropriate by the factor analysis. The factor analysis allows one to conclude that 50 items give a more or less complete indication of the seven training areas. These 50 items can be grouped into seven meaningful components: creative problem solving (five questions); personal awareness (six questions); staff development (five questions); planning (19 questions); goal setting (six questions); the school as an ecosystem (six questions); and the principalship (five questions). See Table 1 (Appendix) for specific psychometric data on the instrument.

The Cronbach alphas for these subscales follow: creative problem solving (.82); personal awareness (.86); staff development (.82); planning (.94); the school as an ecosystem (.76); the principalship (.82); and goal setting (.82).

The Cronbach value for the entire instrument was .96. Table 2 (Appendix) indicates summary statistics for the 50 items in the final version of the instrument. Listed are item communalities, means (M), Medians (Mdn), modes (Mo), standard deviations (SD), and standard errors (SE).

THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL METHOD

Using this research base established in the literature, we next went to the college of education faculty of a large university department (n=100) in the Southwestern United States and asked them to assess their training needs in several management areas subsumed under planning, development, and assessment.

Our original needs assessment questionnaire was modified slightly to enable the university faculty surveyed to determine their skill needs. See Table 3 (Appendix) of this document for a copy of the instrument. The instrument assessed training desires in the following specified areas: (1) staff development; (2) staff performance planning; (3) creative problem solving; (4) personal awareness; (5) performance management; (6) organization/action planning; (7) performance evaluation; (8) clinical supervision; and (9) college-wide goal setting.

These subscales and a brief content description of each follows. Organizational planning focused on resource assessment, program planning,

implementation, and monitoring functions. Next was problem solving. Questions focused on real department organizational problems from the perspective roles, communication skills, and problem solving steps.

The third subscale, performance management and evaluation, focused on role performance standards and effectiveness assessment, as well as monitoring team, task force and individual progress toward defined goals. Next was college-wide goal setting. Questions addressed boundary assessment, dispersement of college goals, and developing a college-wide goal setting process.

The fifth subscale addressed was personal awareness, embracing the perspectives of personality characteristics, self-concept, and personal-style effectiveness. Next there was staff development subscale encompassing clinical supervision, faculty training, and evaluation. Staff performance planning addressed strategies for faculty performance, performance plans, and role performance standards. Finally, there was a clinical supervision subscale embracing the ideas of coaching for faculty as they practice new techniques in their classes.

SKILL NEEDS OF THE FACULTY

What emerged from the faculty assessment of perceived needs was a distinct pattern worth noting. It was clear that the faculty was not prepared in their professional programs for the management emphasis which was assessed. Consequently faculty members were faced with a management focus with little knowledge or skills for successful performance.

The one hundred faculty members who responded to our needs assessment reported a personal concern for training at a beginning level in all the

areas surveyed. The faculty rated each question by stating their desire on a range of one to six:

1) No Training (Skill Unrelated/Not a Priority at this time)
2) Training: Awareness Level (You are unfamiliar with the specific practice or process noted and request a brief presentation)
3) Training: Skill Building (You are somewhat familiar with the practice and prefer initial training)
4) Training: Skill Refinement (You are familiar with the practice or process and have had some training or experience. You prefer opportunities for practice, feedback and refinement of skills)
5) Assistance with College Implementation (You are very familiar with the practice or process and would welcome feedback and assistance in implementing the practice)
6) Competency High: Interested in New Alternatives (You feel your degree of competency is high, and you are open to new concepts and methodologies that will further enhance your skills)

The higher the mean index of responses was, the greater was the expressed desire for training. A mean of "one" would suggest no training interest in a certain category; a mean of "two" would indicate a need for basic training; a mean of "six" would suggest a high level of knowledge and skill in a particular area. Of the nine categories surveyed, faculty members reported they desired training in all categories, with the desires ranging between an awareness level and skill refinement (means between "two" and "four" in all categories).

Table 4 (Appendix) outlines the preferences for training of all the faculty members; all training in role categories emerged as important to role success. The personal awareness area emerged as the category of most concern, reflecting the faculty concern for matters pertaining to self-concept, personality, leadership style and their influence on leadership behaviors. The last ranked category was college-wide goal setting. However, the range between the least and most important is insignificant: the faculty reported a desire for job knowledge and skills in all areas. This study sought to determine the faculty's training needs in relation to specific instructional leadership tasks which influence successful leadership. The participants' responses affirm that the management tasks are perceived as valuable. Moreover, these tasks are a desirable focus for professional development activities. The skills necessary for successful collaboration, organizational analysis and a knowledge of how personal characteristics influence leadership all appear to be important to college faculty as areas of university faculty development.

REFERENCES

Anastasi, A. (1976). Psychological Testing (4th ed.). New York: MacMillan.

Armor, D. et al. (1976). Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Program in Selected Los Angeles Minority Schools. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Austin, G. R. (1979, October). "Exemplary Schools and the Search for Effectiveness." Educational Leadership, 37: 10-14.

Brookover, W. B. & Lezotte, L. W. (1979). Changes in School Characteristics Coincident with Changes in Student Achievement. East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University. (ED 181 005).

California State Department of Education (1980). Report on Special Studies of Selected ECE Schools with Increasing and Decreasing Reading Scores. Sacramento, CA: Office of Program Evaluation and Research.

Clauset, K. H. & Gaynor, A. K. (1982, December). "A Systems Perspective on Effective Schools," in Educational Leadership. 40: 54-59.

Cohen, M. (1981, April/May). "Effective Schools: What Research Says." Today's Education, p. 48-G.

Coulson, J. E. (1977, July). "Overview of the National Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act." Santa Monica, CA: System Development Corporation.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). "Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests." Psychometrika, 16, 297-334.

Cronbach, L. J. (1970). Essentials of Psychological Testing. New York: Harper and Row.

Doss, D. & Holley, F. (1982). "A Cause for National Pause: Title I Schoolwide Projects." Austin, TX: Office of Research and Evaluation, Austin Independent School District. ORE Publication No. 81.55.

Ebel, R. L. (1956). "Obtaining and Reporting Evidence on Content Validity." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 16: 269-282.

Ebel, R. L. (1965). Measuring Educational Achievement. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Edmonds, R. R. (1979, October). "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." Educational Leadership, 37: 15-27.

Edmonds, R. R. (1982, December). "Programs for School Improvement: An Overview." Educational Leadership, 4: 4-11.

Gigleotti, J. & Brookover, W. B. (1975). "The Learning Environment: A Comparison of High and Low Achieving Elementary Schools: Urban Education, 10: 256-257.

Glenn, B. C. (1981). What Works? An Examination of Effective Schools of Poor Black Children. Cambridge, MA: Center for Law and Education, Harvard University.

Hicks, C. R. (1973). Fundamental Concepts in the Design of Experiments. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hinkle, D. E. & Wiersma, W. (1979). Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Chicago: Rand-McNally College Publishing Company.

Hobson, P. J. (1976). "Structured Parental Involvement: An Analysis of a Title I Summer Parent Guided AT HOME Project." Doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, pp. 80-81.

Huddleston, E. M. (1956). "Test Development on the Basis of Content Validity." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 16: 283-293.

Jenkins, G. D. & Taber, T. D. (1977). "A Monte Carlo Study of Factors Affecting Three Indices of Composite Scale Reliability." Journal of Applied Psychology, 62: 392-398.

Kast, F. E. & Rosenzweig, J. E. (1979). Organization and Management: A System Approach. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Kaufman, R. A. (1972). Educational System Planning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kim, J. O. (1975). "Multivariate Analysis of Ordinal Variables." American Journal of Sociology, 81: 261-298.

Kim, J. O. & Mueller, C. W. (1978). Factor Analysis. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Kirk, R. (1968). Experimental Design: Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Klausemeier, H. J. (1982, September). "A Research Strategy for Educational Improvement." Educational Digest, 48: 19-22.

Labovitz, S. (1967). "Some Observations on Measurement and Statistics." Social Forces, 46: 151-160.

Labovitz, S. (1970). "The Assignment of Numbers to Rank order Categories." American Sociological Review, 35: 515-524.

Lemke, E. & Wiersma, W. (1976). Principles of Psychological Measurement. Chicago, IL: Rand-McNally.

Lennon, R. T. (1956). "Assumptions Underlying the Use of Content Validity." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 16: 294-304.

Levine, D. U. & Stark, J. (1981, August). Extended Summary and Conclusions: Institutional and Organizational Arrangements and Processes for Improving Academic Achievement at Inner City Elementary Schools.

(mimeo) Kansas City, MO: University of Missouri-Kansas City, School of Education, Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education.

Lieberman A. & Miller, L. (1978). Introduction to Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lysakowski, R. S. & Walbert, H. J. (1982, Winter). "Instructional Effects of Cues, Participation and Corrective Feedback: a Quantitative Synthesis." American Educational Research Journal, 19: 559-578.

Madden, J. V. et al. (1976). "School Effectiveness Study: State of California." Paper presented at AERA, San Francisco.

Marcus, A. C. et al. (1976, April 14-16). "Administrative Leadership in a Sample of Successful Schools from the National Evaluation of the Emergency School." System Development Corporation. Santa Monica, CA. Paper presented at AERA Convention, pp. 12-16.

Miller, L. & Wolf, T. (1978). "Staff Development for School Change: Theory and Practice." Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives. Edited by A. Lieberman & L. Miller. New York: Teachers College Press.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Brent, D. H. (1975). Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Novick, M. R. & Lewis, C. (1967). "Coefficient Alpha and the Reliability of Composite Measurements." Psychometrika, 32: 1-13.

Nunnally, J. C. (1967). Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nunnally, J. C. (1970). Introduction to Psychological Measurement. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Phi Delta Kappa (1980). Why Do Some Urban Schools Succeed? The Phi Delta Kappa Study of Exceptional Urban Elementary Schools. Birmingham, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Reagan, B. (1977, December). Reported to Joseph M. Cronin. "Parents and Educators: Mutual Allies." Phi Delta Kappa, p. 243.

Sarthory, J. A. (1977). "Needs Assessment and the Practitioner: Problems and prospects." Educational Technology, 17: 24-26.

Southard, M. (1974). "A Framework for Evaluating Needs Assessment Models." Unpublished manuscript, Florida State University-Tallahassee.

Stevens, S. S. (1946). "On the Theory of Scales Measurement." Science 103: 677-680.

Tittle, C. R. & Hill, R. J. (1967). "Attitude Measurement and Prediction of Behavior: An Evaluation of Conditions and Measurement Techniques." Sociometry 30: 199-213.

Tyler, R. (1946). Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Vallina, S. A. (1978). "Analysis of Observed Critical Task Performance of Title I-ESEA Principals of Illinois." Ed.D. dissertation, Loyola University, pp. 156-166.

Vanezky, R. I. & Winfield, L. F. (1979). Schools That Succeed Beyond Expectation in Reading. (Studies on Educational Technology Report No.1) Newark: University of Delaware.

Witkin, R. R. (1977). "Needs Assessment Kits, Models, and Tools." Educational Technology, 17: 4-18.

A P P E N D I X

TABLE 1

ITEM NUMBERS, SUBSCALE AFFILIATION, AND FACTOR LOADINGS OF ADMINISTRATORS-FOR-CHANGE-TRAINING ITEMS

Item Number Initial Version	Item Number Final Version	Specific Subscale	Factor Loading
2	2	Planning	0.53643
26	19	Planning	0.44132
28	20	Planning	0.42469
34	23	Planning	0.56416
44	28	Planning	0.48922
45	29	Planning	0.54881
47	30	Planning	0.40853
48	31	Planning	0.53440
52	33	Planning	0.47156
53	34	Planning	0.43055
54	35	Planning	0.45006
58	37	Planning	0.50075
60	38	Planning	0.52190
62	39	Planning	0.65509
64	40	Planning	0.54036
68	44	Planning	0.40738
72	46	Planning	0.53442
74	48	Planning	0.55914
75	49	Planning	0.57047
18	14	Principalship	0.41312
23	17	Principalship	0.44634
24	18	Principalship	0.40187
33	22	Principalship	0.56485
35	24	Principalship	0.52183
40	26	Personal Awareness	0.73853
42	27	Personal Awareness	0.73157
51	32	Personal Awareness	0.40379
55	36	Personal Awareness	0.64508
71	45	Personal Awareness	0.69274
73	47	Personal Awareness	0.52278
13	10	Creative Problem Solving	0.64388
14	11	Creative Problem Solving	0.67645
15	12	Creative Problem Solving	0.46134
16	13	Creative Problem Solving	0.45535
19	15	Creative Problem Solving	0.40104
30	21	Staff Development	0.41496
65	41	Staff Development	0.71802

TABLE 1--Continued

Item Number Initial Version	Item Number Final Version	Specific Subscale	Factor Loading
66	42	Staff Development	0.46332
67	43	Staff Development	0.71799
76	50	Staff Development	0.46679
10	7	School As An Ecosystem	0.40592
11	8	School As An Ecosystem	0.71327
12	9	School As An Ecosystem	0.71176
21	16	School As An Ecosystem	0.36231
38	25	School As An Ecosystem	0.30542
1	1	Goal Setting	0.53643
2	2	Goal Setting	0.42218
3	3	Goal Setting	0.53402
4	4	Goal Setting	0.46474
6	5	Goal Setting	0.48904
8	6	Goal Setting	0.46491

TABLE 2

Summary Statistics for the One-Column Instrument

Item Number Final Version	Communality	M	Mdn	Mo	SD	SE
1	0.45966	3.658	3.750	5	1.442	0.069
2	0.49748	3.803	4.014	5	1.438	0.068
3	0.53785	3.756	4.057	5	1.512	0.072
4	0.55876	3.914	4.347	5	1.484	0.071
5	0.44801	3.466	3.320	2	1.452	0.069
6	0.52804	3.738	4.035	5	1.510	0.072
7	0.40652	3.864	4.044	5	1.406	0.067
8	0.64550	3.448	3.437	3	1.388	0.066
9	0.58510	3.260	3.273	3	1.421	0.068
10	0.56622	3.941	4.236	5	1.362	0.065
11	0.68830	4.090	4.560	5	1.377	0.066
12	0.45709	3.900	4.061	5	1.311	0.062
13	0.52961	4.145	4.523	5	1.344	0.064
14	0.51157	3.860	4.124	5	1.373	0.065
15	0.59612	4.106	4.572	5	1.408	0.067
16	0.47208	3.468	3.458	5	1.432	0.068
17	0.58380	3.957	4.523	5	1.471	0.070
18	0.53447	4.016	4.386	5	1.364	0.065
19	0.52903	3.891	4.114	5	1.381	0.066
20	0.53979	3.934	4.133	5	1.333	0.063
21	0.52449	3.835	4.124	5	1.404	0.067
22	0.57280	3.905	4.272	5	1.357	0.065
23	0.59578	3.706	3.868	5	1.432	0.068
24	0.59050	3.921	4.181	5	1.340	0.064
25	0.54558	3.654	3.786	5	1.501	0.071
26	0.66280	3.903	4.167	5	1.389	0.066
27	0.67418	3.928	4.253	5	1.362	0.065
28	0.48750	3.912	4.235	5	1.433	0.068
29	0.58159	3.876	4.179	5	1.437	0.068
30	0.62966	3.905	4.329	5	1.451	0.069
31	0.56524	3.876	4.123	5	1.437	0.068
32	0.44634	3.941	4.191	5	1.341	0.064
33	0.60779	3.744	3.925	5	1.430	0.068
34	0.58177	3.867	4.081	5	1.334	0.063
35	0.53460	3.842	4.075	5	1.475	0.070
36	0.56484	4.072	4.506	5	1.370	0.065
37	0.63752	3.729	3.923	5	1.514	0.072
38	0.59904	3.758	4.076	5	1.482	0.071
39	0.69267	4.034	4.542	5	1.384	0.066
40	0.53887	4.034	4.448	5	1.376	0.065
41	0.65279	4.066	4.537	5	1.365	0.065

TABLE 2 Continued

Item Number Final Version	Communality	M	Mdn	Mo	SD	SE
42	0.55061	3.989	4.322	5	2.320	0.063
43	0.63096	4.131	4.539	5	1.346	0.064
44	0.59563	3.869	4.134	5	1.426	0.068
45	0.62612	3.828	4.073	5	1.387	0.066
46	0.58401	3.708	3.890	5	1.498	0.071
47	0.56754	3.910	4.314	5	1.376	0.065
48	0.61219	3.955	4.511	5	1.488	0.071
49	0.55036	3.697	3.900	5	1.445	0.069
50	0.66471	4.167	4.743	5	1.507	0.072

TABLE 3

SURVEY FOR IDENTIFYING COLLEGE FACULTY IN-SERVICE NEEDS

Introduction

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain pertinent information regarding your college-faculty role, related knowledge, skills and also your desire for training. The information will be used to plan training sessions for educational leaders in a college or university setting. The questionnaire contains a list of selectively-designed questions pertaining to the process, knowledge, and skills that are required of college personnel in the following areas: goal setting and action planning, college organization and subgroup action planning; staff performance planning; clinical supervision; staff development; performance management; performance evaluation; personal awareness; and creative problem solving.

Please respond from the perspective of your leadership role if the question applies to you in that manner, or your participant role if a leadership role response is not appropriate.

Directions

On the following pages, read the statements describing various process skills. Then indicate the extent of your interest or desire for training by circling a number in the left-hand column. The following directions may be used to guide your responses:

1) No Training (Skill Unrelated/Not a Priority at this time) - - You do not desire training in the practice or procedure because you feel the skill is unrelated to your role or is not a priority at this time.

2) Training: Awareness Level - - You are unfamiliar with the specific practice or process noted and request a brief presentation.

3) Training: Skill Building - - You are somewhat familiar with the practice and prefer initial training.

4) Training: Skill Refinement - - You are familiar with the practice or process - have had some training or experience. You prefer opportunities for practice, feedback and refinement of skills.

5) Assistance with College Implementation - - You are very familiar with the practice or process and would welcome feedback and assistance in implementing the practice.

6) Competency High (Interested in New Alternatives) - - You feel your degree of competency is high, and you are open to new concepts and methodologies that will further enhance your skills.

	No Training (Skill Unrelated/ Not a Priority		Training: Awareness Level		Training: Skill Building		Training: Skill Refinement	Assistance with College Implementation	Competency High (Interested in New Alternatives)	
I. COLLEGE WIDE GOAL SETTING										
(1)	1	2	3	4	5	6				Managing the boundaries between college and university/state/federal pressures for change
(2)	1	2	3	4	5	6				Managing the boundaries between department/ committee and college pressures for change
(3)	1	2	3	4	5	6				Dispersing college goals to specific sub-groups for action planning
(4)	1	2	3	4	5	6				Altering the influence of forces that impact on the accomplishment of college goals
(5)	1	2	3	4	5	6				Converting my concerns into goals and action plans
(6)	1	2	3	4	5	6				Assessing the growth needs of the college organization
(7)	1	2	3	4	5	6				Increasing my vision of what is possible in my college/department/committee
(8)	1	2	3	4	5	6				Identifying the various forces at work and their negative and positive influence on college goals
(9)	1	2	3	4	5	6				Planning for the involvement of staff and/or students in setting college/department/committee goals
(10)	1	2	3	4	5	6				Identifying the sources of and the categories for college goals

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	No Training (Skill Unrelated/ Not a Priority)	Training: Awareness Level	Training: Skill Building	Training: Skill Refinement	Assistance with College Implementation	Competency High (Interested in New Alternatives)	
			I. COLLEGE WIDE GOAL SETTING (cont.)				
(11)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Ensuring that college goals reflect the concerns of the entire college community
(12)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Developing a college-wide goal setting process
			II. COLLEGE ORGANIZATION AND ACTION PLANNING				
(13)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Analyzing available resources for college activities
(14)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Prioritizing activities to accomplish college goals
(15)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Developing strategies for accomplishing college goals
(16)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Assigning responsibilities for goal attainment tasks
(17)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Organizing my department around college goals
(18)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Identifying the subsystems of the college and their impact on department performance
(19)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Analyzing a college as an ecosystem
(20)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Developing staff leadership skills
(21)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Linking college goals to department growth plans
(22)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Setting short range project goals
(23)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Developing group communication skills for planning meetings

	No Training (Skill Unrelated/ Not a Priority)	Training: Awareness Level	Training: Skill Building	Training: Skill Refinement	Assistance with College Implementation	Competency High (Interested in New Alternatives)	
			II. COLLEGE ORGANIZATION AND ACTION PLANNING (cont.)				
(24)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Defining the function of group leaders
(25)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Translating college goals into department/ committee action plans
(26)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Deciding specific actions (events) that need to occur to accomplish college/ department/committee goals
(27)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Developing a time-line of events so that goals will be accomplished
(28)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Setting priorities for effective goal implementation and management
			III. STAFF PERFORMANCE PLANNING				
(29)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Determining annual strategies for individ faculty performance
(30)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Developing role performance standards
(31)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Developing annual performance plans that reflect college priorities and personal contributions, needs and interests
(32)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Linking college/department goals to individual performance plans
			IV. CLINICAL SUPERVISION				
(33)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Including peers in the observation of instruction
(34)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Developing feedback strategies for the supervisory conference

	No Training (Skill Unrelated/ Not a Priority)	Training: Awareness Level	Training: Skill Building	Training: Skill Refinement	Assistance with College Implementation	Competency High (Interested in New Alternatives)	
				IV. CLINICAL SUPERVISION (cont.)			
(35)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Developing pre-observation conference planning techniques
(36)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Developing procedures for collecting and analyzing classroom observation data
(37)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Developing skills in data collection
(38)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Defining the emphasis for supervision with each professor
				V. STAFF DEVELOPMENT			
(39)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Identifying appropriate learning activities for inservice programs
(40)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Defining staff priority needs for inservice programs
(41)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Incorporating individual growth goals into inservice program plans
(42)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Identifying individual, as well as total faculty growth needs
(43)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Sequencing learning activities in inservice programs to foster desired growth
				VI. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT			
(44)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Increasing staff motivation for improved role performance
(45)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Setting priorities for effective performanc management

	No Training (Skill Unrelated/ Not a Priority)	Training: Awareness Level	Training: Skill Building	Training: Skill Refinement	Assistance with College Implementation	Competency High (Interested in New Alternatives)	
VI. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT (cont.)							
(46)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Determining when to intervene in the improvement process
(47)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Keeping the college/department/committee faculty on an agreed-upon course of activities and practices
(48)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Monitoring individual and group performance
(49)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Controlling college/department/committee activities so that goals are accomplished
VII. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION							
Individuals							
(50)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Linking college goals to faculty evaluation
(51)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Linking individual goals to performance evaluation
(52)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Defining the criteria for staff evaluation
(53)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Developing a data base for evaluation
Departments/Committees							
(54)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Evaluating the outcomes of goal attainment activities
(55)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Conducting periodic assessment of college improvement-plan accomplishments
(56)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Defining the criteria for team/college evaluation

1 = No Training (Skill Unrelated/ Not a Priority)
2 = Training: Awareness Level
3 = Training: Skill Building
4 = Training: Skill Refinement
5 = Assistance with College Implementation
6 = Competency High (Interested in New Alternatives)

VIII. PERSONAL AWARENESS: FACULTY/ADMINISTRATION/CHAIRPERSONSHIP

(57) 1 2 3 4 5 6 Identifying personal factors that foster college leadership

(58) 1 2 3 4 5 6 Identifying my beliefs in relation to college productivity

(59) 1 2 3 4 5 6 Identifying my personality characteristics and their influence on my effectiveness

(60) 1 2 3 4 5 6 Identifying personal leadership style and its effect on my performance

(61) 1 2 3 4 5 6 Determining the combined effect of my personality, self-concept, leadership and beliefs on my job performance

(62) 1 2 3 4 5 6 Identifying gaps between my beliefs and current college practices

(63) 1 2 3 4 5 6 Identifying my self-concept strengths and weaknesses and their effects on my professional goals

(64) 1 2 3 4 5 6 Assessing my own professional growth needs

IX. CREATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING

(65) 1 2 3 4 5 6 Developing group creative problem-solving skills

(66) 1 2 3 4 5 6 Leading a staff toward creative solutions to problems

1 = No Training (Skill Unrelated/ Not a Priority)
2 = Training: Awareness Level
3 = Training: Skill Building
4 = Training: Skill Refinement
5 = Assistance with College Implementation
6 = Competency High (Interested in New Alternatives)

IX. CREATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING (cont.)

(67)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Critiquing ideas while keeping communications open
(68)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Critiquing problem solutions until they are acceptable and workable
(69)	1	2	3	4	5	6	Clarifying and analyzing department/personal problems succinctly

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please mark the appropriate blank. Feel free to add comments when you feel that they are applicable.

JOB TITLE which (one or two categories) best describes your role(s):

___College Dean ___College Associate Dean ___Chairperson

___College Professor ___College Associate Professor

___College Assistant Professor

___Committee Chairperson

___Other (specify)_____

YOUR COLLEGE within the university:_____

YOUR DEPARTMENT within your college:_____

YOUR COMMITTEE:_____

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN ADMINISTRATION:_____

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN UNIVERSITY LEVEL TEACHING:_____

SIZE of university:

___less than 1,000 students ___15,000 to 20,000 students

___1,000 to 5,000 students ___20,000 to 25,000 students

___5,000 to 10,000 students ___25,000 to 30,000 students

___10,000 to 15,000 students ___more than 30,000 students

SIZE of your college within the university:

___Less than 1,000 students ___4,000 to 5,000 students

___1,000 to 2,000 students ___5,000 to 6,000 students

___2,000 to 3,000 students ___6,000 to 7,000 students

___3,000 to 4,000 students ___more than 7,000 students

ETHNIC BREAKDOWN (rough percentage) of your student body:

___% Anglo ___% Black ___% Spanish-speaking

___% Asian ___% Other: specify_____

COMMENTS/REACTIONS:_____

_____

DATE:

TABLE 4

ENTIRE EDUCATION FACULTY

RANKING (HIGH-TO-LOW) OF THE NEED INDICES FOR THE NINE AREAS ASSESSED IN THE SURVEY

RANK		NEED INDEX
#1	PERSONAL AWARENESS	3.722
#2	STAFF DEVELOPMENT	3.708
#3	CREATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING	3.607
#4	CLINICAL SUPERVISION	3.490
#5	ORGANIZATION/ACTION PLANNING	3.428
#6	STAFF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT	3.303
#7	PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT	3.287
#8	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	3.233
#9	COLLEGE-WIDE GOAL SETTING	2.951

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT

RANKING (HIGH-TO-LOW) OF THE NEED INDICES FOR THE NINE AREAS ASSESSED IN THE SURVEY

RANK	AREA	NEED INDEX
#1	PERSONAL AWARENESS	4.42
#2	CREATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING	3.72
#3	ORGANIZATION/ACTION PLANNING	3.67
#4.5	PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT	3.23
#4.5	CLINICAL SUPERVISION	3.23
#6	COLLEGE-WIDE GOAL SETTING	3.20
#7	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	3.00
#8	STAFF PERFORMANCE PLANNING	2.95
#9	STAFF DEVELOPMENT	2.92

EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS DEPARTMENT

RANKING (HIGH-TO-LOW) OF THE NEED INDICES FOR THE NINE AREAS ASSESSED IN THE SURVEY

RANK	AREA	NEED INDEX
#1	STAFF DEVELOPMENT	3.700
#2	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	3.357
#3	CREATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING	3.300
#4	PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT	3.291
#5	ORGANIZATION/ACTION PLANNING	3.093
#6	STAFF PERFORMANCE PLANNING	3.062
#7	PERSONAL AWARENESS	3.015
#8	CLINICAL SUPERVISION	2.687
#9	COLLEGE-WIDE GOAL SETTING	2.500

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

RANKING (HIGH-TO-LOW) OF THE NEED INDICES FOR THE NINE AREAS ASSESSED IN THE SURVEY

RANK	AREA	NEED INDEX
#1	STAFF DEVELOPMENT	3.728
#2	STAFF PERFORMANCE PLANNING	3.642
#3	CREATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING	3.256
#4	PERSONAL AWARENESS	3.240
#5	PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT	3.071
#6	ORGANIZATION/ACTION PLANNING	2.896
#7	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	2.866
#8	CLINICAL SUPERVISION	2.845
#9	COLLEGE-WIDE GOAL SETTING	2.517

HIGHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

RANKING (HIGH-TO-LOW) OF THE NEED INDICES FOR THE NINE AREAS ASSESSED IN THE SURVEY

RANK	AREA	NEED INDEX
#1	PERSONAL AWARENESS	5.75
#2.5	STAFF DEVELOPMENT	4.90
#2.5	CREATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING	4.90
#4	ORGANIZATION/ACTION PLANNING	4.84
#5	COLLEGE-WIDE GOAL SETTING	4.62
#6	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	4.50
#7	STAFF PERFORMANCE PLANNING	4.37
#8	PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT	4.33
#9	CLINICAL SUPERVISION	4.25

SECONDARY EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

RANKING (HIGH-TO-LOW) OF THE NEED INDICES FOR NINE AREAS ASSESSED IN THE SURVEY

RANK	AREA	NEED INDEX
#1	CLINICAL SUPERVISION	4.620
#2	CREATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING	4.381
#3	PERSONAL AWARENESS	4.351
#4	STAFF DEVELOPMENT	4.090
#5	ORGANIZATION/ACTION PLANNING	3.709
#6	STAFF PERFORMANCE PLANNING	3.499
#7	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	3.493
#8	COLLEGE-WIDE GOAL SETTING	3.378
#9	PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT	3.302